

## General Plan 2020 Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes February 19, 2002

---

### Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Liz Higgins	San Diego Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Mike Stepmr	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Thure Stedt	Save Our Land Values

### Public at Large:

Charlene Ayers	
David Pallinger	Ramona
David Younkman	NWF
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Jim Esposito	
Lynne Baker	EHL
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Mike Menghini	Julian Merchants
Mike Thometz	MERIT
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Paul B. Etzel	SDSU/Astronomy
Ruth Potter	
Sachiko Kohatsu	BOS/Slater

### County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)  
Gary Pryor (DPLU)  
Ivan Holler (DPLU)  
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)  
Michelle Yip (DPLU)  
Tom Harron (County Counsel)  
Peggy Gentry (WRT)

### Agenda Item I: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for February 5, 2002
- Bowlby corrected his statement on pp. 2 (1<sup>st</sup> bullet under Agenda Item I): Bowlby stated that he felt the density was far too much for that particular valley, and not just a valley.
  - Gendron corrected her statement on pp. 2 (1<sup>st</sup> bullet under Agenda Item II): Gendron was concerned that the proposed language would override environmental protection.
  - Adams thought that policy E of Land Use Goal I was to read: ...respects the character of the community and *respects* environmental resources, rather than *protects*. Consensus was not reached on this statement and staff was charged to review the tapes. Wording will be left as-is in the February 5<sup>th</sup> minutes and will be discussed at the next meeting, when the recorded wording is brought forth.
  - Doyle moved to approve. Adams seconded the motion. Minutes approved.
- b) "Tools" Sub-committee Update
- Stehly stated that the sub-committee was making progress. The group will meet again at 10:45 am on the day of the next Interest Group Committee meeting. He added that the sub-committee will be completing 10 to 20 points of whether "this is possible" or "are we dreaming", to be handed to the committee, to filter to the consultants.
- c) Non-agenda Item
- Stepner stated that those representatives from the APA, AIA, and ASLA are not able to attend the meetings on Tuesdays. He requested that the meetings revert back to Mondays.
  - **Motion:** Tabb moved to change the meetings to Mondays. Stedt seconded the motion. Other members disagreed due to the change they had already made in their schedules and those who found that they were unable to make Monday meetings. Scarborough tabled the discussion to the end of the meeting in anticipation of Messer's arrival, as the meetings were changed upon her request.

### Agenda Item II: Draft Revisions to the Goals & Policies –

a & b) Discussion & Action (all items were based on staff's draft revisions)

<i><b>Motion:</b></i>	<i><b>Approved Revision:</b></i>
<b>Land Use Goal I</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <b>Policy H:</b> Pryde moved to replace <i>communities</i> with <i>urbanized areas</i>, rather than striking the policy. Bowlby seconded the motion. Higgins stated the reason <i>and planned</i> (BIA proposal) was included was to be able to take care of SPAs and items on the books but not existing, in order to reach our housing goals. Pryde stated he was willing to accept <i>and planned</i> if the development interests of the group were willing to accept his wording. Whalen stated that it does not make sense because if it were planned, then it is not urbanized and by leaving <i>and planned</i> out, 4S Ranch would be inconsistent because it is not existing, but planned. Chase feels that it should be omitted because <i>existing communities</i> is ill-defined. Scarborough suggested <i>existing and planned urbanized areas</i>. Coombs asked what <i>planned</i> meant. Pryde responded that it means in accordance with what will be the adopted GP2020 plan.</li><li>▪ <b>Vote:</b> 13 – 1 – 1 (Gendron opposed, Coombs abstained)</li></ul>	<i>Development should be directed towards areas of existing and planned urbanization.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <b>Policy I:</b> Silver moved to amend the language with the BIA's proposal. Gendron seconded the motion.</li><li>▪ <b>Vote:</b> 15 – 0 – 0</li></ul>	<i>Clustering should be encouraged.</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Policy J:</b> Doyle asked what the intention was for striking the latter portion of the policy (BIA proposal). Stedt responded that the language was too ambiguous to be placed in a policy. Adams moved to accept the language as amended by the BIA. Silver requested to amend the language by retaining the latter portion and adding <i>should</i> before <i>be retained</i>. Stedt seconded the motion. Bowlby opposed the first <i>should</i>.</li> <li>▪ <b>Vote:</b> 14 – 1 – 0 (Bowlby opposed)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Urban growth should be directed to areas within or adjacent to existing urban areas and that the rural setting and lifestyle of the remaining areas of the County should be retained.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Policy K:</b> Adams moved to amend the language with the BIA's proposal. Whalen seconded the motion. Chase asked why this policy was limited to transportation and suggested including <i>adequate, existing, or planned infrastructure</i>. Adams and Whalen agreed to the amendment. Doyle stated that <i>public transportation</i> should be retained. Pryor suggested omitting <i>public</i>. The term <i>planned</i> in this policy is defined as it was in policy H under this goal.</li> <li>▪ <b>Vote:</b> 13 – 2 – 0 (Gendron and Bowlby opposed)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site higher density and intensity uses in areas with adequate, existing, or planned transportation and infrastructure.</i></p>
<b>Land Use Goal II</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Policy A:</b> Adams moved to amend the language with the BIA's proposal. Stedt seconded the motion. Adams stated that <i>maintain</i> is static and <i>respect</i> allows for unique design. Higgins stated that there are areas that we may not want to maintain and enhance. Gendron stated that we needed to keep the language strong in order to maintain the backcountry. She does not think <i>respect</i> is strong enough since no one is respecting the unique character of Alpine. Chase suggested <i>enhance</i>. Stedt was willing to support the change in language. Adams accepted the amendment. Doyle stated he liked the word <i>respect</i> since there are fundamental areas that we want to respect. By leaving just <i>enhance</i>, every community can only be enhanced, not respected and to him, enhance means to build out. Adams was willing to keep <i>respect and enhance</i>. Silver thinks <i>enhance</i> means improve and there are communities out there that need some change to their patterns of development.</li> <li>▪ <b>Vote on Enhance:</b> 10</li> <li>▪ <b>Vote on Respect and enhance:</b> 5 (Coombs, Pryde, Doyle, Stepner, and Bowlby)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Enhance the unique character of each individual unincorporated community.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Policy B:</b> Adams moved to amend the language with the BIA's proposal. Stepner asked why <i>only</i> was omitted. Adams responded that it was static. Coombs questioned <i>appropriate</i> and stated it should not be used in any policy. Adams thinks <i>feasible and appropriate</i> are appropriate in this policy because we need to identify what kind of development goes. Higgins suggested omitting <i>public</i> to open the door for private. Pryor stated that policy K under Land Use Goal I makes this policy redundant. Adams and Stedt moved to strike the policy. Pryde responded to Coombs, stating <i>appropriate</i> is interpretable in many ways. Suggested <i>and appropriately sized</i> so intensity is appropriately sized. Doyle does not agree with striking the policy because he feels the policy speaks to two different goals. Coombs suggested <i>can be provided</i> instead of <i>feasible and appropriate</i>. Adams and Stedt agreed to the amendment. Bowlby stated that there has to be something feasible to be provided.</li> <li>▪ <b>Vote:</b> 12 – 0 – 2 (Bowlby and Chase abstained)</li> </ul>	<p><i>Development should occur only in areas where necessary facilities and services can be provided.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Policy C:</b> Doyle suggested changing this policy into two different policies, one for density and one for lot sizes. Pryor responded that lot size is a zoning tool. Adams moved to amend the language with the BIA's</li> </ul>	<p><i>Design standards for new development and redevelopment should be</i></p>

<p>proposal. Chase seconded the motion. Coombs requested to expand the policy to redevelopment. Adams agreed to add <i>redevelopment</i>. Pryor responded that this was a good change since it is design features you are after.</p> <p>▪ <b>Vote:</b> 14 – 0 – 0</p>	<p><i>compatible with community character.</i></p>
<p>▪ <b>Policy D:</b> Stedt moved to amend the language with the BIA's proposal. Adams and Stepner seconded the motion. Chase thinks we should note adjacent uses can be incompatible and should have transitions or buffers. Coombs thinks we need to keep open space buffers and not just patterns. Stedt stated that he would not be encouraged to change that. He did not oppose the suggestion but felt it should be placed elsewhere. Higgins agreed it should be placed someplace else. Bowlby stated he supported staff's language. Chase agreed that she liked staff's amendment as well.</p> <p>▪ <b>Vote:</b> 11 – 3 – 0 (Coombs, Bowlby, and Gendron opposed)</p>	<p><i>Development in unincorporated communities that is adjacent to incorporated cities should consider the development and open space pattern in both the city and unincorporated community and the existing and planned infrastructure and services.</i></p>
<p>▪ <b>Policy E:</b> Pryde suggested <i>natural greenbelts</i>. Pryor cautioned using the term since farming is considered a greenbelt but not natural. Stedt stated that the actual discussion of greenbelts should be moved to Open Space. Stedt moved to have this policy moved to the Open Space. Adams seconded the motion. Doyle stated that it is not about the open space aspect but rather about the community character, the look and feel, and the pattern of how the community is constrained. Coombs stated that in order to be consistent, any mention of public facilities would need to be taken out, as it would be the same case for redundancy. Greenbelts are part of the community character and belongs in the Land Use goals for community character. Doyle added they are a fundamental part of establishing community character.</p> <p>▪ <b>Vote:</b> 7 – 7 – 0</p> <p>▪ Adams moved to delete <i>between communities</i>. Stedt seconded the motion. Stedt stated that he was concerned there was not enough discussion on greenbelts. Pryor responded that it does not matter from a pure planning standpoint. Some are looking at greenbelts as part of the land use pattern, which keep communities from growing together. They are concerned about the pattern as it relates here. As well as, the manner in which Stedt speaks of, greenbelts belong under Open Space.</p> <p>▪ <b>Vote:</b> 10 – 2 – 2 (Pryde and Gendron opposed, Coombs and Bowlby abstained)</p>	<p><i>Greenbelts should be established and maintained.</i></p>
<p><b>Land Use Goal III</b></p>	
<p>▪ <b>Policy A:</b> Adams moved staff's proposal. Chase seconded the motion.</p> <p>▪ <b>Vote:</b> 14 – 0 – 0</p>	<p><i>Provide mechanisms for the acquisition or dedication of voluntary perpetual agriculture conservation easements.</i></p>
<p>▪ <b>Policy B:</b> Bowlby moved staff's proposal. Chase seconded the motion. Stehly stated that this policy is meaningless since we are not going to have areas designated for agriculture. Agriculture is allowed by right throughout the County. Pryor replied that when these were drafted, it was thought there were going to be areas designated but Stehly is correct, agriculture is a use and will be identified in the Zoning Ordinance. It was envisioned at one point that there was going to be an agriculture element. Pryor stated it was an error on staff's part we cannot keep the language</p>	

---

in because there are no designated areas. Staff recommends to strike the policy. Adams moved to strike the policy. Stehly seconded the motion.

- **Vote:** 9 – 2 – 3 (Pryde and Gendron opposed; Doyle, Coombs, and Chase abstained)

- 
- |   |                                |
|---|--------------------------------|
| ▪ <b>Policy C:</b> Adams moved staff's proposal. Stedt seconded the motion. | <i>Allow for agri-tourism.</i> |
| ▪ <b>Vote:</b> 14 – 0 – 0   |                                |
- 

- |  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| ▪ <b>Policy D:</b> Adams moved staff's proposal. Stedt seconded the motion.  | <i>Staff will review.</i> |
| ▪ <b>Vote:</b> 14 – 0 – 0  |                           |
| ▪ Bowlby's version of staff's recommendations had the words <i>land for</i> stricken from the policy. Since the vote retained <i>land for</i> , Bowlby opposed the motion. |                           |
| ▪ <b>Vote:</b> 13 – 1 – 0  |                           |
| ▪ Silver questioned a policy that <i>establishes policies</i> .  |                           |
- 

- |  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| ▪ <b>Policy E:</b> Stedt moved staff's proposal. Adams seconded the motion. Silver asked why the policy was stricken. Pryor responded that it was a zoning issue rather than general plan. Pryde suggested staff look over policies D and E again. | <i>Staff will review.</i> |
|--|---------------------------|
- 

#### **Land Use Goal IV**

---

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| ▪ <b>Policy A:</b> Adams moved the BIA's proposal. Higgins seconded the motion. Bowlby supports leaving in <i>community character</i> . He asked why <i>for site plan review</i> was omitted. Pryor responded that criteria might be site plan review, architectural standards, height, and bulk, so the language was too specific. Pryde suggested changing <i>community character</i> to <i>neighborhoods</i> . Adams suggested <i>respects community character</i> . | <i>Establish criteria to ensure that industrial developments are compatible with adjacent land uses and respects community character.</i> |
| ▪ <b>Vote:</b> 14 – 0 – 0   |   |

#### **Agenda Item III: Process –**

- Holler stated that staff has received the digitized maps from the consultants. Staff is currently in the process of error checking and looking at the difference in the public land layer in the model. We are anticipating that it will be ready for the next meeting.
- Adams requested to have a special meeting for the map and continue with the draft revisions to the Goals & Policies at the regular meeting. Tabb agreed to this suggestion.

#### **Agenda Item IV: Public Comments –**

- Lynne Baker stated that she thinks greenbelts can be as simple as creating walkable green space through a community. It is clear we are going to have connections and corridors on the map. There may be some interconnectivity we may want to provide. We need to provide land to meet housing needs and we have enough infrastructure if we want to build out. We have a lack of affordable housing.
- A member of the public requested that the "so-called credits" for downzoning and the credits people give to preserves be established quickly.